



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,543	11/21/2001	Toshiharu Katada	111163	1690
25944	7590	03/01/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			REID, CHERYL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,543

Applicant(s)

KATADA ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl M. Reid

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart.

Claims 1-3, 5-7

- Stewart teaches of an input element...a location information.....the second device access the.....(Col 2, lines 50-67, Col 3, lines 4-8); input element (access point) and location information element (access point) included....(Col 2, lines 60-63); specific device is transmitted.....first (portable device) and the second device (service provider)....(Fig 1A, Col 5 lines 60-65, Col 6 lines 5-40).

Claims 9-10

- Stewart teaches of transmitting of least one of a location.....(Col 2, lines 50-67, Col 3, lines 4-8; second device to access first device.....)(Fig 1A, Col 5 lines 60-65, Col 6 lines 5-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of official notice.

Claims 4 and 8

- Stewart does not explicitly teach of a search element that can search device groupsSearch elements that search for a device on a network is well-known in the arts and thus official notice is taken. Common used programs such as Microsoft Windows has this functionality. A person can search for a device (ex. A friend's or co-worker's computer) by going to the search function and typing in the name of the computer. An objective of Stewart's invention is to service mobile users with services such as notifying rental agency of the user's location (Col 3, lines 29-45). Adding a search element that can search for a specific device would be an overall improvement to Stewart's invention because it would allow service providers such as hotel and rental car agency the ability to search

for a specific client. This would result in a more efficient and versatile system. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modification.

5. Claims 11, 13 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi and Dupperouzel and Hara.

Claims 11, 15 and 18-19

- Yamaguchi teaches of a first device service unit (Fig 1, item 10 or 11) that generates.....a second device service unit that generates (Fig 1, item 10 or 11).... a first web server unit (Fig 1, item 10 or 11) that sends the data.... a second web server unit (Fig 1, item 10 or 11) that sends the data....(Paragraph [0015], [0016]). Yamaguchi does not explicitly teach of displaying the web page on a screen. Dupperouzel teaches on this aspect (Col 1, lines 64-67). Yamaguchi does not teach ofon the screenare drag-and-dropped... hands over at least one of a location information....and the second device service unit accesses the first device service unit.....acquires from the first device service unit....the specific data...Dupperouzel teaches of drag-and-dropping data from one web browser to another (Col 2, lines 30-35, Col 4, lines 58-67, Fig 2). Dupperouzel is silent in regards to acquiring from the first device specific data. Hara teaches on this aspect (Col 4, lines 45-60, Col 5, lines 3-17). Yamaguchi,

Dupperouzel, and Hara's invention all relate to communication systems. Adding the above feature to Yamaguchi's invention would result in a more efficient image forming apparatus because it would provide enhance functionality of combining various contents(data) from different sources (web servers) using drag-and-drop techniques and the ability to access specific data. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modifications.

Claim 13

- Yamaguchi teaches of using FTP (Paragraph [0111]).

Claims 14 and 16

- Yamaguchi did not explicitly teach of using IPP. Yamaguchi's invention objective is to provide an image forming apparatus (Paragraph [0009]). Yamaguchi teaches of methods of printing (Paragraph [0009]) and using LPR. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Yamaguchi's invention so that it would also use IPP because this would result in a more versatile and comprehensive image forming apparatus. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modifications.

Claim 17

- Yamaguchi teaches of using LPR (Paragraph [0200]).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi and Dupperouzel and Hara as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Stewart.

Claim 12


- Yamaguchi teaches of using HTTP (Paragraph [0004]). Yamaguchi, Dupperouzel and Hara did not explicitly teach of a web server unit provided between the first device unit and the second device wherein the second device accessed the first device. Stewart teaches on this aspect (Col 2, lines 50-67, Fig 1A). Examiner is interpreting access point (third server unit), mobile user (first device) and service provider (second device). Adding the above-mentioned feature to Yamaguchi's invention would result in a more versatile and efficient system because it would provide another way of accessing the desired data. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above mentioned modifications.
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M. Reid whose telephone number is 571 272 3903. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on (571)272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmr


JACK D. HARVEY
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER